

### REMARKS


In the Office Action mailed February 1, 2005, the Examiner objected to claim 1 because the text ended with a comma. By this paper, claim 1 has been amended to correct this informality.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and claims 13 and 15 were rejected under U.S.C. 102(b). By this paper, claims 13 to 15 have been cancelled, thus obviating these rejections.

Claims 1 – 14 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,660,887. Filed concurrently herewith is a terminal disclaimer to overcome this rejection.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration by the Examiner is earnestly requested. Should the Examiner find any impediment to the prompt allowance of the claims which could be corrected by telephone interview with Applicant's attorney, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig M. Lundell

Reg. No. 30,284

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP

P. O. Box 4433

Houston, TX 77210

Date: March 16, 2005